



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/681,530

10/08/2003

Steven M. Casey

020366-092600US

7288

84190

7590

06/18/2009

Qwest Communications International Inc.
1801 California St., #900
Denver, CO 80202

EXAMINER

CZEKAJ, DAVID J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2621

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/18/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/681,530	Applicant(s) CASEY ET AL.	
	Examiner DAVID CZEKAJ	Art Unit 2621	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 March 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 and 13-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 and 13-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-30 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kimura et al. (5913078), (hereinafter referred to as "Kimura") in view of Passman et al. (6636256), (hereinafter referred to as "Passman").

Regarding claim 1, Kimura discloses an apparatus that relates to a camera capable of recording photograph information of the camera (Kimura: column 1, lines 8-11). This apparatus comprises "a location sensor" (Kimura: figure 2, wherein the location sensor is the GPS receiver), "an image sensor" (Kimura: figure 1, wherein the image sensor is the camera), "a microprocessor communicably coupled to the location sensor and image sensor" (Kimura: figure 2, wherein the microprocessor is the control section), "receiving a location from the location sensor" (Kimura: figure 2, wherein the GPS receiver will provide the location to the control section), "receiving an image from the image sensor" (Kimura: figure 1, wherein the camera will provide the image), and "associate the

location with the image” (Kimura: figure 48, wherein the location data is displayed along with the image data). However, this apparatus lacks the central monitor as claimed. Passman teaches that there is a need in the prior art for a cost effective transfer of vital information to a remote station (Passman: column 2, lines 21-26). To help alleviate this problem, Passman discloses “a plurality of imaging devices” (Passman: figures 1-2), “a network interface in communication with a network” (Passman: figure 1), “associate the location with the image in a set of image data and communicate the set over the network” (Passman: figures 1-2; column 3, lines 55-60), “a central monitor remote from the image sensor configured to receive the set of image data, display an image from the data, and plot a device location on a map, the device location being derived from the monitoring data and representing the location of the imaging device” (Passman: column 3, lines 55-65; column 4, lines 10-29). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the apparatus disclosed by Kimura and add the processing taught by Passman in order to obtain an apparatus that can cost effectively transmit data to a remote location.

Regarding claim 2, Kimura discloses “a distance and direction sensor” (Kimura: figure 2, wherein the gyroscope provides the distance and direction), “receiving a distance and direction from the sensors” (Kimura: figure 2, wherein the gyroscope provides the information to the system), and “calculating a second location based in part on the first location, the direction, and the distance,

wherein the first location is the location of the image sensor and the second location is the location of the object in the image” (Kimura: column 5, lines 35-49, wherein the location of the object is determined by using the direction, distance, and locations).

2. Claims 3-5, 7-8, 10-11, 13-25, and 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kimura et al. (5913078), (hereinafter referred to as “Kimura”) in view of Passman et al. (6636256), (hereinafter referred to as “Passman”) in further view of Clapper (6023241).

Regarding claim 3, note the examiners rejection for claim 1, and in addition, claim 3 differs from claim 1 in that claim 3 further requires providing the location of the object to a query data base. Clapper teaches that information provided by travel recorders is relatively limited (Clapper: column 1, lines 30-33). To help alleviate this problem, Clapper discloses “a transmitter to provide the location of the object in the image to a query database” (Clapper: column 2, lines 56-67, wherein the query database is the excursion server). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the query database taught by Clapper in order to obtain an apparatus that provides a plurality of information to a variety of travelers.

Regarding claim 4, Clapper discloses “a receiver operable to receive description information from the database” (Clapper: figure 2, wherein the receiver is the IR interface).

Regarding claim 5, Clapper discloses “the object is a landmark wherein the information about the landmark is walking directions” (Clapper: figure 7, wherein the landmark is the Washington Monument; column 6, lines 47-52, wherein the walking directions is the navigation assistance).

Regarding claim 7, Clapper discloses “a display operable to display information selected from the following: the image” (Clapper: figure 7).

Regarding claim 8, Clapper discloses “access a map, wherein the map includes a route from the image sensor to the object and providing the map to the display” (Clapper: column 6, lines 55-59, wherein the map mode provides the route).

Regarding claim 10, Clapper discloses “associate the location from the sensor with successive frames of the image” (Clapper: column 4, lines 55-59, wherein the successive frames is the move clip).

Regarding claim 11, Kimura discloses “capturing an object image” (Kimura: figure 1, wherein the camera captures the image), “capturing a location of the image sensor” (Kimura: figure 2, wherein the GPS receiver captures the location), “capturing a direction and distance from the sensor to the object, and calculating an object location as a function of the location, direction, and distance” (Kimura: column 5, lines 35-45, wherein auto focus is known feature of digital cameras).

Regarding claim 13, Clapper discloses “providing a request for information about the object, wherein the request includes the location of the object”

(Clapper: column 2, lines 28-65, wherein providing a request is taking the image of the landmark).

Regarding claim 14, Clapper discloses “receiving information about the landmark” (Clapper: column 2, lines 60-67).

Regarding claim 15, note the examiners rejection for claim 5.

Regarding claim 16, note the examiners rejection for claim 7.

Regarding claim 17, note the examiners rejection for claim 1, and in addition, Kimura discloses “storing the object image and information about the object” (Kimura: figure 9, wherein item 13 is memory used for storage).

Regarding claim 18, note the examiners rejection for claim 1. In addition, the examiner notes that GPS signal strength sensors are an inherent part of GPS devices. .

Regarding claim 19, note the examiners rejection for claim 7.

Regarding claim 20, Kimura discloses “updating the display to include the image and the location” (Kimura: figure 30).

Regarding claims 21-22, note the examiners rejection for claim 2.

Regarding claim 23, note the examiners rejection for claim 3.

Regarding claim 24, note the examiners rejection for claim 4.

Regarding claim 25, note the examiners rejection for claim 5.

Regarding claim 27, Clapper discloses “the handheld camera is a video camera and a still camera” (Clapper: column 3, lines 54-67, wherein the still image is provided; column 4, lines 55-60, wherein a movie is provided).

Regarding claim 28, note the examiners rejection for claim 10.

Regarding claim 29, Kimura in view of Passman in view of Clapper disclose “an image capture device including an image sensor, location sensor, and transmitter, and a central monitor remote from the capture device operable to receive an image and location, and a dispatch module in communication with the monitor to receive an indication of an event occurrence and communicate the location to the dispatcher” (Kimura: figures 1-2; Passman: figures 1-3; column 5, lines 8-42; Clapper: figures 2 and 7).

2. Claims 6 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kimura et al. (5913078), (hereinafter referred to as “Kimura”) in view of Passman et al. (6636256), (hereinafter referred to as “Passman”) in further view of Clapper (6023241) in further view of Kubota et al. (6401029), (hereinafter referred to as “Kubota”).

Regarding claim 6, note the examiners rejection for claim 3, and in addition, claim 6 differs from claim 3 in that claim 6 further requires the information to be a menu for a restaurant. Kubota teaches that information in a database can include restaurant menus (Kubota: column 9, lines 18-36).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the restaurant information in the database in order to provide more information to the user.

Regarding claim 26, Kubota discloses “the information includes rates of a hotel” (Kubota: column 13, lines 21-30).

3. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kimura et al. (5913078), (hereinafter referred to as “Kimura”) in view of Passman et al. (6636256), (hereinafter referred to as “Passman”) in further view of Clapper (6023241) in further view of Fernandez et al. (6697103), (hereinafter referred to as “Fernandez”).

Regarding claim 9, note the examiners rejection for claim 1, and in addition, claim 9 differs from claim 1 in that claim 9 further requires a topological map. Fernandez teaches that there is a need for more flexible and scaleable solution for monitoring remote objects (Fernandez: column 1, lines 25-30). To help alleviate this problem, Fernandez discloses “a topological map” (Fernandez: column 10, lines 5-10). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the topological map in order to better help track objects throughout a scene.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

Art Unit: 2621

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DAVID CZEKAJ whose telephone number is (571)272-7327. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs and every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mehrdad Dastouri can be reached on (571) 272-7418. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Dave Czekaj/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2621